

Dear Js (cc FG),

9/5/72

You will remember that recently I reported "il's comment that Jack Anderson's columns recently are actually hidden promotion of Nixon. If this seems incredible, I believe today's bears on this as do other recent ones some of which I've noted to you.

The Post's head is "New Drug Wave Points Westward". This and the column saying it are really quite false. I think you can get the angle from the beginning of the lead sentence, "President Nixon's herculean effort to stop drug smuggling..." These herculean efforts consist of presiding over an enormous increase and refusing to do anything about the major source, under our control, our Southeast Asia narcotics, and their means of communication, the CIA, which also subsidizes them besides using its planes for them.

Then Anderson cites and quotes from two CIA memos, the dates being part of the giveaway, June 9 and 26. These are AFTER the new McCoy study was well known and the involvement of the CIA was about to be widely publicized. Under the circumstances, I think this is not a leak but a deliberate feed that, for whatever reason, Anderson took uncritically. It serves CIA purposes and is so designed. It says that the new major sources are "allies" Iran and Afghanistan, and even tries to pin blame on India with a clever formulation in which I think the average reader will miss the key words, "legal" and "medicinal", "As for India, the documents say it now produces about three-quarters of the world's legal opium for medicinal purposes." Control is then said to be a "myth". Now the reality is that at least 3/4 of the opium comes from S.E. Asia, not India, Iran, Afghanistan or anywhere else, and all of this is under the control of CIA people of various sorts.

Especially with all the attention to this uncontested fact, beginning with McCoy's still-uncontested Congressional testimony, is so obviously propagandistic a column cause for thought. It is incompetent reporting, amateurish at best. It has been proven false over and over. There was recently a long piece in Time, for example, on this, I believe also in Life, there is the attention to the McCoy book now being reviewed and out or about to be out (documenting the case against the CIA itself), and there is the inability of the CIA to come up with any kind of refutation when offered the chance by lawyers, which seemed a bit anxious to get out from under McCoy.

If I am without ready explanation of what this means, it is obvious that this is pro-Nixon and pro-CIA propaganda and in both cases worse than false for both are responsible and neither has really done anything. It also coincides with two related things: Anderson's atypical ignoring of the Watergate Capers story and his involvement with one of those arrested. That man, Fiorini, has been tied to the theft of papers from O'Brien's files and some of these have appeared in Anderson's column in the recent past. *Perd/Guns along* *STARSD*

Meanwhile, back on the urban ranchero, FG is being fed the most awful pap by one who claims past connection with the CIA. It seems that to his knowledge she has a deal with the Reader's Digest that he has reason to believe will include treatment of both CIA and dope. So he suddenly develops current sources inside mainland China and from them gets info. And he actually accuses her that China is financing Castro by shipping dope to Castro, who sells it in the US, thus fighting the US and getting money from it. FG knows nothing about the politics involved or the fact, both of which preclude the possibility and might, indeed have used this to a mass audience. Net effect: other CIA exculpation, with the side benefit of good propaganda against "the enemy".

If there is one thing that could not have been secret from the CIA, it is its own involvement in dope and the astounding increase in its production and use by Americans, particularly troops. From the outset important enough people had to have had sufficient knowledge. As is usually the case with the politically dedicated, the political objective is all that counts and the other costs are accepted as essential to the quintessential objective, the purity of which, naturally, just can't be questioned. Too bad, but c'est la guerre. There is a parallel to virtually every military dictatorship of modern times and virtually every frustration of every effort to overthrow one. Need one say more than "Dominican Republic"?

Anderson is too experienced, too sophisticated, to be unaware that at the very best he is being used. I think in context it has to be considered that he is conscious of what he is into and that this, in turn, means he is in some kind of bind. The Watergate Capers and the Fiorini involvement do not exhaust the possibilities.

The overt propaganda for, this sudden overt support of Nixon, both indicate there may be something rather serious behind all of this.